

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/088,664	Applicant(s) HUANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Dr. Kailash C. Srivastava	Art Unit 1651	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dr. Kailash C. Srivastava, Examiner.

(3) Mr. Nanda P.B.A. Kumar, Representative.

(2) Mr. Christopher R. Tate, Examiner.

(4) Mr. William J. McNichol, Jr., Representative.

Date of Interview: 24 February 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: NONE.

Claim(s) discussed: Those of Record.

Identification of prior art discussed: yes.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.




CHRISTOPHER R. TATE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiners informed the applicant's representatives that the proposed amendments to claims of record drawn to compositions comprising a mixture of three or more isolated components would be considered non-responsive and therefore would not be entered. Secondly, the proposed claims as amended would appear to constitute new matter as the specification does not reasonably teach a composition comprising three or more isolated orange peel components for anti-cancer therapeutic.